

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claims 5-8, 18-23, and 28 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Appreciation is expressed for the indication of allowability of these claims.

Claims 1, 4, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Samay et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,276,406 (Samay). Claims 13, 16, 17, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Liu, U.S. Pat. No. 6,236,274 (Liu). Claims 2, 3, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Samay. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Samay in view of Yip, U.S. Pat. No. 6,664,871 (Yip). Claims 14, 15, 27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Henry Choe for the examiner interview with Applicant's Attorney David G. Dolezal on September 9, 2005. During the interview, claims 4 and 9 were discussed.

Applicants would like to incorporate the comments in the Remarks section of Response of April 25, 2005 (Response) in this Response to Final Office Action.

In addition, Applicants would like to further comment on the rejections to dependent claims 4, 9, 16, and 25.

Claims 4 and 9

As stated above, claims 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Samay.

Regarding claims 4 and 9, neither the First Office Action dated January 25, 2005 (First Office Action) nor the Final Office Action dated June 15, 2005 (Final Office Action) set forth a prima facie rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in that Samay does not disclose all of the limitations of dependent claims 4 and 9.

Page 2 of the First Office Action identifies capacitor C7 of Samay as a low frequency decoupling capacitor. However, nowhere in the description of Samay does it state that capacitor C7 is a tantalum capacitor. Accordingly, claims 4 and 9 are not anticipated by Samay.

Page 2 of the Office Action states that "capacitor C7 in Fig. 1 of Samay et al is functionally equivalent to the claimed tantalum capacitor and ceramic capacitor." However, functionally equivalent is not a proper standard for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the use of a tantalum capacitor for a low frequency decoupling capacitor is a non obvious limitation that may provide a benefit over a circuit utilizing other types of capacitors. As Applicants have set forth in the Specification as originally filed, one advantage of using a tantalum capacitor for a low frequency decoupling capacitor is that a tantalum capacitor provides a relatively lower self resonant frequency than a ceramic capacitor of the same capacitance. This may result in the low frequency decoupling capacitor having a relatively higher impedance at the carrier frequency and therefore a relatively lesser effect on the output signal path in some embodiments. See paragraph 0025 of the Specification. Because Samay does not disclose these features, Samay can not be used to suggest that capacitor C7 is a tantalum capacitor.

Accordingly, claims 4 and 9 are allowable over Samay.

Claim 16

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Liu, U.S. Pat. No. 6,236,274 (Liu).

Regarding claim 16, neither the First Office Action nor the Final Office Action set forth a prima facie rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in that Liu does not disclose all of the limitations of dependent claim 16.

Page 3 of the Office Action identifies capacitor 21 of Figure 4 of Liu as a low frequency decoupling capacitor. However, nowhere in the description of Liu does it state that capacitor 21 is a tantalum capacitor.

Page 3 of the Office Action states that "capacitor 21 in Fig. 4 of Liu is functional equivalent to the claimed tantalum capacitor and ceramic capacitor." However, functionally equivalent is not a proper standard for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Accordingly, claims 16 is not anticipated by Liu.

Applicants respectfully submit that the use of a tantalum capacitor for a low frequency decoupling capacitor is a non obvious limitation that may provide a benefit over a circuit utilizing other types of capacitors. As Applicants have set forth in the Specification as originally filed, one advantage of using a tantalum capacitor for a low frequency decoupling capacitor is that a tantalum capacitor provides a relatively lower self resonant frequency than a ceramic capacitor of the same capacitance. This may result in the low frequency decoupling capacitor having a relatively higher impedance at the carrier frequency and therefore a relatively lesser effect on the output signal path in some embodiments. See paragraph 0025 of the Specification. Because Liu does not disclose these features, Liu can not be used to suggest that capacitor 21 is a tantalum capacitor.

Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over Liu.

Claim 25

The First Office Action and the Final Office Action do not set forth a rejection for claim 25 over the prior art of record. Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079, Freescale Semiconductor, Inc..

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: 

David G. Dolezal
Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 41,711

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6854

Email: David.Dolezal@Freescale.com